

SPEAKER'S RULING *Re* : STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF MINISTER AT DELHI AND THE PRIVILEGE QUESTION BY SRI S. GOPALA GOWDA

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda gave notice of a privilege motion yesterday under Rule 178. He referred to what the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said in Delhi as seen in a press report. contends that as a result of the press report the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Opposition have been brought into contempt and therefore there is a breach of privilege and he wanted the procedure to be followed.

In the first place, I must tell the hon'ble Member and the House that what he has said does not indicate that he wants permission to bring it. Any how, I have examined the matter in all thoroughness. He should have quoted the exact words which he says amount to a contempt but he has not done so. He has, however, helped me by giving a copy of the press cutting. I have gone through that very carefully and all that is said in it is that so far as the party position in Mysore is concerned, there may be a likelihood of some members from the Opposition joining the ruling party and that one member has joined.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Sir, before the ruling is given, I would like to say.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not bound to hear the hon'ble Member. Every time I dictate the ruling, if what I say is not agreeable to him... ..

Sri K. H. PATIL.—My humble submission is that every member has a right at the time of giving ruling if it is adverse to the fact or law to bring it to the notice of the Chair. Once a ruling is given, even if I know a fact I cannot bring it to the notice of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri K. H. Patil is enunciating something which I can never agree with. The hon. Member thinks that when the ruling is being given if a member feels that he must at once disturb the giving of the ruling he must be given a chance to do so because once the ruling is given it will bind him and afterwards he cannot object to it and that it is the inherent right of every member. What does he mean ?

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I only said that after the ruling is over I am bound by it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is exactly what I also have said. The hon'ble member says he has got an inherent right to make representation. I do not think he has got an inherent right like that. He can only ask for permission and if the Speaker permits and if the circumstances warrant, before the ruling is given and before the matter is closed or reserved for ruling, he may be permitted to say something. But if every member says he must be heard, then I have to hear 216 members before I give a ruling and at the time of giving the ruling? He says everybody has got an inherent right. What kind of right is this? There will be no end to this and at this rate no work will be possible.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—By inherent right I do not mean constitutional right, but as a rule of justice if any adverse ruling is to be given it should be given after hearing the members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When I give a chance to you, then I will have to allow Sri Sivappa, Sri Gopala Gowda and Sri Banakar and others also.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—I do agree. If you do not permit me I have no chance. All that I am trying is to convince the Speaker because I have something new which will help the Speaker to give the ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member has got the habit of saying that he has something new and I have found that there is nothing new.

I have read every word of the Press Report. If I only compare it with what has been stated on the floor of the House in so far as party position, party alignment and change of parties are concerned, there will be a bulk which can be brought under the head of breach of privilege or contempt of the House. The fact that it has been stated outside does not make any difference. If it is contempt it is contempt when said in the House and it is equally contempt when it is said outside. If I have heard the proceedings, there has been a lot that has been said by one against the other, "you are trying to tempt my members" "you are trying to tempt my members", "this should not happen, this is unethical" etc. I do not think there is any force in the contention that there is any breach of privilege. I am sorry I am unable to give my consent to that.

Member's Representation

† **Sri S. SIVAPPA** (Sravanabelagola).—Sir, there is one important point regarding the Official Language Bill to be brought before Parliament. A news item has appeared today that the State Governments will be consulted and that particularly the Chief Ministers are being consulted regarding the contents of the Bill and that before taking any decision all the State Legislatures also are to be consulted and a decision is to be taken by the State Legislatures also before a final decision is taken in the matter. I want to know whether anything has been received by the State Government from the Central Government regarding the Official Language Bill and if the Chief Minister has been consulted regarding the matter. I would request the Speaker to direct the Chief Minister to state whether anything has been received from the Centre regarding the contents of the Official Language Bill to be brought before Parliament and whether the Chief Minister is thinking of consulting this House before giving this Government's final opinion on the Bill.